Labour Monthly

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

6d

AFTER THE BRIGHTON T.U.C.

Harry Pollitt

LABOUR, SOCIALISM— AND Mr. MORRISON

Alex Massie

December, 1946

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVIII. No. 12

CONTENTS

December, 1946

	Page
Notes of the Month—by R. P. D.	359
After the Brighton T.U.C. by HARRY POLLITT	366
Elections in France by DEREK KARTUN	372
Labour, Socialism—and Mr. Morrison by ALEX MASSIE	374
Mr. Churchill's Record by E. M. WINTERTON	378
Malaya's "Constitution" by H. B. LIM (Secretary of the Malayan Democratic Union)	380
Disarmament, V. M. Molotov's Speech	383
Book Reviews—	
Transatlantic Tariffs by F. V.	385
Primitive Accumulation in New England by A. R.	385
The New Czechoslovakia by J. W.	386
Manual for Exploiters by J. D.	386

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES : United Kingdom, 12 months 12s. Postage paid. Abroad 13s. from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, or from all leading wholesalers and bookshops.

A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3s. a year inclusive of postage.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LOOK OUT FOR THE NEW ENLARGED

LABOUR MONTHLY

IN

JANUARY, 1947

K. ZILLIACUS, M.P., on British Foreign Policy

ARTHUR HORNER on Coal at Midwinter

E. VARGA on World Economics and Politics

LEONARD BARNES on Trusteeship and the Colonial Question

and other features

LARGER PAGE
BIGGER TYPE
WHITE PAPER

PRICE ONE SHILLING

Order your Copy from your Bookseller

OR

Take out a year's subscription. (For Subscription Rates see inside page).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Special reduced rate for postal subscribers to the New Labour Monthly

PRICE ONE SHILLING

With the new size and price of the Magazine, we are making a new arrangement whereby every home subscriber will get this shilling Magazine POST FREE, and every subscriber abroad will receive it at a REDUCED postage rate.

- THUS FOR TWELVE SHILLING PER ANNUM READERS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM WILL HAVE THE LABOUR MONTHLY DELIVERED TO THEM BY THE POSTAL SERVICE.

- EXISTING SUBSCRIBERS, BOTH AT HOME AND ABROAD, WILL CONTINUE TO RECEIVE THE MAGAZINE AT THE OLD RATE UNTIL THEIR CURRENT SUBSCRIPTION EXPIRES.

Fill up the form below:—

APPLICATION FOR POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION.

Name..... *Address*.....
(Please use Block Capitals)

.....

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 12/- (*Home*) / 13/-(*Abroad*) *to cover*

12 *months' subscription beginning with the*.....*issue.*
(Strike out the words which do not apply)

Signed..... *Date*.....

Why not take out a year's subscription for your friends as

A CHRISTMAS GIFT?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

MURDER will out. Mr. Bevin's policy (which is still the policy of the majority of the Labour Cabinet, though personalised in the public mind through its mouthpiece, Mr. Bevin) is being found out. Last month the Trades Union Congress two and a half million, undeterred by Mr. Attlee's threats and warnings, plainly voiced their condemnation. This month the motion of the fifty-eight Labour M.P.s, which the test of abstentions on the final vote revealed to have the support, despite disciplinary threats, of over one hundred, has voiced the revolt within the Parliamentary Labour Party. The Left has begun to be joined by representatives of the Centre. At last the political battle for the future of world co-operation or conflict, which was opened in the United States by Wallace, and which is being powerfully waged by the Soviet representatives in the United Nations and was given impetus on a world basis by Stalin's public statements, is extending on a major scale in this country also. Things are moving. They will have to move faster to meet the urgency of the situation.

Twelve Months' Awakening

Twelve months ago the Communist Party and a tiny handful on the left were alone in exposing the dangers to which the Government's foreign policy was leading. In the early months it was an uphill fight to combat the roseate illusions begotten by electoral victory and a parliamentary majority and dreams of easy reformist reconstruction, and to awaken opinion to the ugly realities of the imperialist policy which was being pursued. But facts have a way of justifying a correct policy. In the early years after 1933 it was at first an uphill fight of a minority to expose the realities of Anglo-Nazi co-operation at a time when official Labour policy was still accepting at face value the peace speeches of Hitler, applauding Hoare as the Voice of Britain, approving the armed entry into the Rhineland and supporting non-intervention in Spain. But through the years of experience that initial protest of a minority broadened into a mighty flood which drew within an inch of victory. This time we must see that victory is won before it is too late.

Revolt from Below

This extending revolt reflects the fruits of the tireless labours of tens of thousands of militants in the factories and trade union branches during the past twelve months—labours which in each individual case may appear to the unthinking weak and ineffectual before the entrenched forces to be fought, but which in the final aggregate move mountains. When the Tory spokesman in the debate, Captain Crookshank, sneered at the "mutiny of intellectuals," he was not only making a remark whose empty vulgarity exactly copied the method of Hitler and expressed the typical Tory-fascist propaganda of endeavouring to set up a barrier of hostility between "intellectuals" and "manual workers" for the benefit of monopoly capital. It was also a remark which in this case was especially wide of the mark. For it was precisely the powerful broadside of two and a half million trade unionists at the Trades Union Congress condemning the Bevin policies which gave the courage to many of the imprisoned intellectuals of the Parliamentary Labour Party to express their convictions aloud, and protected others, who had already risked to speak, from victimisation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Broadening the Front

The front needs to be broadened to draw in all who see the dangers to Britain from the present policies of subservience to Wall Street. It is significant that the new stratum in the Parliamentary Labour Party who have joined the ranks of the critics, with whatever initial hesitations and vacillations, are still anxious to proclaim demonstratively their disassociation from Communism and their belief in the old mythical third alternative of Social Democracy bridging the class struggle. These illusions, however important and dangerous in the final analysis, are of secondary importance in the present immediate issue, provided there is readiness to fight. They are only immediately dangerous if they are allowed to chloroform the struggle which needs to be waged to change the present policy. It is the experience of the fight which will finally show who is the friend and who is the enemy of the cause of the working-class and democracy, of Socialism and of peace.

Facts Teach

Not mere propaganda has brought about this change in public feeling, but hard facts, which daily shatter illusions and compel receptiveness to truths at first unwelcome. Carlyle used to say that experience is "the best of schoolmasters" though "the school fees are heavy." In the present case the bill for the school fees is only beginning to come in. What are the new facts which have helped to bring the first chill of awakening from reformist intoxication? First, the American Republican victory, with all the ugly consequences that victory entails. Second, the now universally and openly expressed fears of an economic slump spreading over the capitalist world. Third, the cost in man-power through the present policy, with delayed demobilisation, eighteen months' conscription in peacetime, and Anglo-American resistance to the Soviet disarmament proposals. Fourth, the slowing down of the home programme, as revealed in the inadequacies of the King's Speech and in recent Ministerial utterances sounding the retreat from Socialism in the best MacDonald style. As against this, positive facts have been the strength of the militant fight at the Trades Union Congress, and the outcome of the French elections.

Two Elections

No greater contrast could be imagined between two elections, revealing the contrast of two worlds, than that between the American and French elections which occurred within a few days of each other in the beginning of November. The Republican landslide in the United States has sent a premonitory shudder throughout the world as the victory of the blackest forces of economic anarchy and militarist aggression. Not least has it raised questioning in this country as to the consequences, economic and political, from what a Labour representative in the debate on the Address has termed a "partnership with the barbaric thugs of Detroit or the mammon imperialists of Washington or Wall Street." By contrast, the French elections have shown that the European working-class is unafraid and unintimidated in face of all the threats and pressure and atom bomb diplomacy of Anglo-American reaction.

American Republican Victory

The American Republican victory in the elections is not necessarily the last word of American popular opinion. The vast body of opinion aroused by Wallace and the C.I.O. had no voice in these elections. All that majority which had followed Roosevelt had been already dissipated and shattered by Truman with an assiduous completeness which could not have been greater if he had been installed by the Republicans as a paid agent in the Democratic machine to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destroy the Roosevelt majority from within. Thus the marvellous efficacy of the two-party governmental system to stultify democracy, which is the grand secret of American political institutions even more than in Britain, was once again demonstrated. The very anger and indignation of the people at the impotence and betrayal of Truman and the Democratic machine helped in practice to swell the Republican majority.

Western Democracy

The elections did not give power to the Republicans; Truman and the Democratic machine had already done that. The elections only served to register what had already been decided on top by the big business interests without pretence of consultation of the people. Eighteen million Republicans defeated fifteen million Democrats; but the policy of the two machines had been already proclaimed identical, both in regard to controls at home and foreign policy abroad. The "bi-partisan" policy of Byrnes and Vandenberg had been assailed by Wallace. This genuine issue was convulsing American opinion and was recognised by the world as the fateful choice before the American people. But the "sovereign" electorate was offered the "choice," not between Truman-Byrnes-Vandenberg and Wallace, but between Byrnes and Vandenberg. Great is "Western democracy."

Monster Unchained

Thus the shudder which went through the world at the American Republican victory was not at the prospect of a change in policy or a shift in power. It was rather at the prospect that the Republican domination of Congress and the Senate for the next two years, universally expected to be followed by a Republican Presidency from 1949, held out the perspective for the fateful next six years of world history that the most aggressive chauvinist sections of American Business would run riot through the world. A few belated Rip Van Winkles among commentators in this country, bred up on memories of the post-Wilsonian sequel to the first world war, muttered fearfully of the prospects of American "isolationism" and expressed the hope that the enlightened outlook of Byrnes and Vandenberg would prevent it. American "isolationism" in the old sense is as dead as Queen Anne, so far as American Big Capital is concerned. The openly proclaimed outlook of the most powerful reactionary sections of American Big Capital today is directed towards aggressive world expansion and domination, utilising every weapon, economic, political and military. This is the menace confronting the world today.

The New Munichism

Hence the alarm which has begun to spread through public opinion in Britain at the prospect of being tied to the chariot wheels of the American Juggernaut. Just as Hitler beat the anti-Communist anti-Soviet big drum to paralyse opposition in every country, facilitate penetration, justify intervention and secure docile allies within each country, so American reaction beats the anti-Communist anti-Soviet big drum today. Panic-stricken at the crisis of the British Empire, conscious of Britain's weakened economic position, and blind with fury and fear and hatred against the Socialist Soviet Union, the new democracies in Europe, the advance of Communism and the rising struggle of the colonial peoples, the leaders of reaction in Britain are prepared to surrender their country to American domination, no matter what the cost. Munichite anti-patriotism assumes new forms. But the Trades Union Congress proceedings and the amendment of the fifty-eight M.Ps. have revealed that British resistance is gathering.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conscription—For What?

This question is no mere question of foreign policy alone. It extends to every field—military, economic, political and domestic policy. How far is Britain already tied by the commitments and secret conversations of the Anglo-American Joint Staffs Committee? How far has Anglo-American military and strategic "integration" already gone? What lies behind the decision to slow up demobilisation, to maintain the staggering figure of one and a half millions armed forces in peacetime, after every visible enemy has been destroyed, and to impose peacetime conscription of eighteen months? The issue is not conscription; universal compulsory military service is the most democratic system for providing the armed forces which are required for fulfilling Britain's commitments under the United Nations and the peace settlements; although the counterpart of any such system should be the democratic reorganisation of the armed forces and protection of the citizen rights of those serving. But the present decisive question is not the question of the principle of conscription. It is the question of the size of the armed forces and of the purposes for which they are used. Are the young people of Britain, desperately needed for reconstruction at home, to be called on to serve as counter-revolutionary armies to maintain the monarchist-fascist regime in Greece or impose colonial subjection in India, Egypt, Iraq, Burma and Malaya? The cost of Mr. Bevin's policy is being brought home to every household and family in Britain.

Disarmament

It is this situation which gives added weight to the Soviet proposals for disarmament presented to the United Nations Assembly. The Soviet proposals for disarmament during the inter-war years and their rejection by the combined votes of every capitalist Power may well be recalled today as a historic landmark which revealed the alignment of forces and the drive to war. Must this unhappy history be repeated anew? Today the situation is even graver, the burden of armaments more crushing, and the new weapons more formidable. The Soviet Union is the only Power which has proposed the total prohibition and destruction of all atom bombs. The United States Baruch Plan is a transparent cover for maintaining the United States atom bomb stocks and monopoly as an instrument for world domination. With the Molotov proposals the Soviet Union is leading the way for the reduction of armaments in every field.

Unilateral Disarmament

The Soviet Union has led the way to unilateral disarmament since the war, but cannot continue indefinitely alone. The current Soviet budget has halved the figure for military expenditure. The 1946 figure is 72 billion roubles, which contrasts with 128 billion in 1945, and with 56 billion in the last pre-war year (1940). But the 1946 figure includes all the non-military expenditure on war pensions and demobilisation grants arising from the war. Thus the actual military expenditure is already down to pre-war. This is in striking contrast to Britain and the United States. The British figure of £1,193 million contrasts with £253 million in 1938-39, or a more than fourfold increase. The United States figure has increased thirteen times over. "In the 1938 budget appropriations for national defence were less than one billion dollars, compared with thirteen billion dollars for the present fiscal year" (Wallace, letter to Truman, July, 1946). The proportion of the Soviet budget devoted to defence expenditure is 22 per cent., the British 30 per cent. and the American 33 per cent. These figures understate the contrast, since the Soviet budget includes non-military items, and Wallace has stated that the total propor-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the American budget on expenditure arising from war is more like four-fifths. How long must this situation continue? It is the vital concern of the British and American peoples to see that this mad arms race promoted by the Anglo-American bloc is checked.

Footing the Bill

No less serious are the consequences in the economic sphere. The current deficit on the British balance of payments for 1946, on the basis of the available figures for the first nine months, runs at £425 million for the year. But according to the estimate presented during the Washington negotiations no less than £300 million of the total deficit is for "non-recurrent Government expenditure overseas." What is this Government expenditure overseas? "Most of it is for military purposes" (*Economist*, November 16). There is the £80 million thrown on the British taxpayer through maladministration and inefficiency of the British zone in Germany and permitted Nazi sabotage of controls and production. There are all the costs of the vast armies in Greece, the Middle East and Asia. There are the subsidies to maintain and equip reaction in Greece and elsewhere. Thus two-thirds of the deficit on the British balance of payments are due to Mr. Bevin's policy. The drafts on the American loan, amounting to £150 million so far, are more than eaten up by Mr. Bevin's policy, and have served nothing to help British reconstruction. Are the British workers to be called on to sweat to build up exports in order to pay for Mr. Bevin's military adventures abroad, or to import luxury fruits and wines for the upper classes?

Shadows of the Slump

With alarm the prospect of a slump spreading over the capitalist world from the American madhouse is now openly discussed on all sides. The Communist warning was disregarded at Bournemouth; but the skeleton can no longer be kept in the cupboard. Ministers have changed their tune. The election programme declared: "No more dole queues"; "Full employment can be achieved." But with 370,000 registered unemployed, the King's Speech has moved down to "a high and stable level of employment." Mr. Attlee's diatribe against Communism to the Trades Union Congress was accompanied by Mr. Isaacs' not so accidental slip of the tongue, "When the slump comes." Mr. Marquand crossed the t's and dotted the i's when he made his well-known statement in Parliament on November 5; the day of the American elections:—

> We might have to anticipate in the near future something like the slump we experienced in 1921.

Let it be remembered that in 1921 unemployment in Britain reached 23 per cent.

"Everybody Knows"

Irradiating optimism, Mr. Marquand continued:—

> We must look forward at a much later date to a world depression coming on such as we had in 1929. . . . In planning for the dangers of a world depression upon a large scale we have, I think, still a little breathing space in which to make our plans.

That is, of course, always something to "look forward" to. And to the naive enthusiast who may have believed that the Government already stood for the method of planned economy ("Labour will plan from the ground up"—electoral programme), which it was understood would guarantee full employment and eliminate slumps, it will, no doubt, come as a relief to learn that the Government has not forgotten the principle of planning and in its second year of office still considers that there is time ahead "to make our plans" for "when the slump comes." As for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impious doubters who may venture to bring up untimely reminders of electoral promises of full employment and no slumps, the *Daily Herald* in its editorial of November 16 answered them with sturdy common-sense:—

> Every instructed person knows that with economic conditions rocking as they now are in the United States, a depression spreading from that country is at least a practical possibility.

The air of November, 1946, is growing chillier than in June, 1945. The laws of capitalism pay scant attention to electoral pledges or to the cloud-castles of reformist make-believe economies.

Retreat from Socialism?

It is in this context that recent Ministerial utterances, expressing their emancipation from vulgar socialist shibboleths about abolishing the profit system or taking industry out of the hands of the capitalists into the hands of the working-class, have taken on a more than academic significance and deepened the chill in the hearts of their more ardent supporters. It would be disputable to regard these utterances as a retreat from socialist principles; since even the most cowardly general could hardly retreat from a position he has never occupied. But they are straws in a stream which reveal a current. When practice conforms to the laws and requirements of monopoly capitalism, it becomes difficult to maintain indefinitely the pink dressing of socialist phrases around a capitalist kernel; and the term "social democracy" begins to be preferred to "socialism." After all, "social democracy" is a convenient and elastic term, which can be used to mean anything and nothing, and which has even been used by Mr. Byrnes, in one of his devastating answers to Molotov and Vishinsky, to describe the essential content of American institutions.

Socialisation of Burglary

Mr. Morrison has announced the grand principle of the "socialisation of the profit-motive," much as one might announce the socialisation of burglary:—

> The Government were not out to abolish the profit-motive, but were out to make it work for the people and not for the few. . . . Only when abuses were rooted out and the profit-motive socialised would it be possible to speak of it as having an honourable part to play in society.
>
> (Herbert Morrison, speech at Birmingham, October 26, *Times*, October 28, 1946.)

As a fireside game for the long winter evenings try reading this sentence with the substitution of "burglary" for the "profit-motive":—

> The Government were not out to abolish burglary, but were out to make it work for the people and not for the few. . . . Only when abuses were rooted out and burglary socialised would it be possible to speak of it as having an honourable part to play in society.

The Honourable Society of Burglars would be moved to tears at this tribute to their long misunderstood calling, and would heartily agree to the elimination of abuses. And similarly the philosophy of the "socialisation of the profit-motive" to serve the true interests of the community with due elimination of abuses is a sentiment which would win the enthusiastic assent of all the great philanthropists who run the big business enterprises of this country and be sure of rapt applause at every Rotarian Club.

The Lower Orders

Sir Stafford Cripps has expressed a very proper and gentlemanly rejection of the conception that working people could be fit to run industry:—

> From my experience, there is not as yet a very large number of workers in Britain capable of taking over

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> large enterprises. . . . Until there has been more experience by the workers of the managerial side of industry, it would be almost impossible to have worker-controlled industry in Britain, even if it were on the whole desirable.
>
> (Sir Stafford Cripps at Bristol, *Times*, October 28, 1946.)

Here we are able to see the contrast between the true freedom and opportunity for all provided by "Western democracy" and "the British school of Socialism," where ninety-five per cent. of the population are, by the admission of a leading Labour Cabinet Minister, disqualified in practice from holding any leading position in running industry, as opposed to the hideous totalitarian tyranny of a State where, as Stalin observed in 1928:—

> From the trade unions are drawn the persons best fitted to occupy the leading positions in all branches of our administration.

Never Again

The morass and quagmire of Social Democracy has cost every working-class movement dear. Its price has been written in country after country in letters of fire: in capitulation to monopoly capitalism, worsened conditions and economic crisis; in political frustration, mass disillusionment, and disruption of organisation; and finally in fascism and in war. Let us not buy our experience here at too heavy a price, when the lessons are available to our hand. The British labour movement must travel a different path.

Social Democracy and Communism

It is an irony that, at the very moment when Social Democracy is going down in discredit in Europe, its tattered record of bankruptcy is being held up as a new gospel of wisdom here. But this phase will pass. It is true that during the past century, since the collapse of Chartism, the development of the political labour movement in this country has lagged a generation behind that of the Continent. In the closing years of the nineteenth century, when Social Democratic (Marxist—not the modern meaning) Parties were well established on a mass basis in all European countries, the British workers were still following Liberals and Tories; and the wiseacres declared that Social Democracy might find a basis in the Continent, but would never suit Britain; there would never be a political labour movement in Britain.

Learning by Experience

Today the political labour movement has won the parliamentary majority in Britain; and, while the European workers are passing from Social Democracy to Communism, Social Democracy is being proclaimed from governmental platforms here as the distinctive philosophy of the British people. Once again the wiseacres are busy proclaiming that Communism may suit the Continental workers, but will never find a mass basis in Britain. Let the wiseacres learn from the record. As surely as the British workers have moved from liberalism to a political labour movement based on the mass organisations of the working-class, so surely will they move to Communism as the programme and policy of victory of the labour movement. And this time the development will be quicker; for the pace of events compels it.

It Moves

Let the wiseacres look, not only to the results of the recent municipal elections, where the Procrustes' bed of the two-party system still compelled the inexorable choice of Tory or Labour in the eyes of the majority, but also to the proceedings of the Brighton Trades Union Congress, the mood in the factories and workshops, the elections to leading positions in the trade unions, and the new currents in the Parliamentary Labour Party and the political labour movement. It moves.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fight that is being waged by the progressive sections of the labour movement to reverse Bevinism abroad and its consequences at home, and enter on a new course, is not only a fight for the most urgent needs of the present situation in Britain. It is also a fight for the future of the labour movement, which means the future of socialism in this country, that the working people of Britain shall not be the tools of imperialist adventurism, dollar diplomacy and war, but shall go forward as the allies of all the progressive peoples of the world to the victory of peace, freedom and socialism.

R. P. D.

November 19, 1946.

After the Brighton T.U.C.

by HARRY POLLITT

IT is always an interesting political experience to contrast the deliberations of the Trades Union Congress with those of the Labour Party Conference, and the Brighton Conference was no exception.

Indeed, perhaps the outstanding impression created in the minds of serious political observers was the contrast between the Bournemouth Labour Party Conference, with its victory and illusory atmosphere accompanied by the complete domination of the platform, and the Brighton Trades Union Congress with its sober and serious facing up to acute and urgent political and economic problems and the positive and constructive role of leadership played by the delegates from the floor.

It is not without pride that I say this difference was undoubtedly because of the part played by so many speakers who are members of the Communist Party as well as active workers in their trade union. It also explains why the Morrisons will move heaven and earth to prevent Communists representing their organisations at the Labour Party Conferences, because they realise the difference it would make in the whole job of formulating policy and deciding issues of leadership.

One of the reasons, of course, why a Trades Union Congress essentially takes on a more serious character than the Labour Party Conference, is that the delegates are representing organisations which are daily and actively engaged in the class struggle, delegates who come up every day against problems arising from issues concerning wages, hours, compensation, Factory Acts, factory and trade union organisations and the whole series of new problems arising out of the drive for nationalisation and increased production.

They, at least, and especially those delegations direct from the factories, have no illusions about what the struggle to maintain or improve working-class conditions means in actual practice. They are closer to the workers, reflect their moods and desires, have their fingers on the pulse of working-class opinion where it always expresses itself most freely and with the least reserve—the factories and trade union branches.

This is fully reflected in the report of the work of the General Council in between the meetings of the Trade Union Congress. It may be useful to give an idea of the multitude of problems the Council has had to deal with since the September, 1945, Congress.

Disputes between unions and organisation problems; trades councils; women's issues; compensation; factory acts; problems of production; colonial questions; international issues; war pensions; reconstruction; safety and welfare; regional boards;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taxation; U.N.O.; unemployment; wages and wages councils; arbitration; health issues; nursing profession; national insurance; local government; income tax; industrial diseases; education. And all these heads indicate only a fraction of the problems the General Council has had to deal with.

One of the outstanding features of the Brighton Congress was the constructive character of many of the delegates' contributions on the various items in the General Council's report, and more and more this report becomes one of the most important features of the work of Congress.

The whole position relating to the scope of the issues the General Council has to deal with raises some new problems also for discussion, which we will touch upon in the concluding section of this article.

One has to take this background into account in trying to assess the significance of the Brighton Congress, otherwise one fails to realise the full import of its decisions and what they mean in terms of warning to the Government.

There was a serious realisation at the Brighton Congress that new pages in trade union history are about to be written, that a new phase is opening in the relation of modern trade unionism to the new problems of organisation, direction and control arising from the developments associated with the nationalisation of some industries, the existence of working parties in other industries and the general new conception of State guidance and planning in regard to industry as a whole.

This attitude was reflected in the careful attention given to certain parts of the presidential address of Mr. Charles Dukes, who quite rightly laid a special emphasis on this side of the situation.

All of us concerned with the whole future development of trade unionism in the new conditions have a lot of hard thinking to do on the new questions which are now on the agenda for speedy solution.

One got the impression at Brighton, listening to the debates, or in conversations in the lobbies, that however the Labour Government may think nationalisation is to be limited both with regard to its scope and its direction, this is certainly not in the minds of the active trade unionists in industry.

And one's strongest impression in relation to this point was the concern felt about the whole future perspective of British industry and trade. When George Isaacs, M.P., mentioned the preparations of the Government to meet "a coming slump," there was not only a gasp among the delegates, who were thinking of the pledge given at the General Election of a policy of full employment, there was an obvious clear recognition of where the danger of the Government's present foreign policy is leading—to the isolation of Britain, a weakening of its economic position, and because of its dependence on America, the danger of being drawn into the vortex of an American economic crisis, about which even the *Daily Herald* on November 2 had to issue a serious warning.

Mr. Isaacs unconsciously helped to strengthen the opposition to the Government's policy concerning Anders' Polish army in Britain; Greece; Spain and foreign policy as a whole, and in particular our participation in an Anglo-American bloc directed against the Soviet Union.

It is also noteworthy that hardly had the Congress terminated than the Prime Minister had to ask the General Council to meet him to discuss the serious economic position this country has to face. He had a tremendous opportunity to do so when he addressed the Congress itself, for then he was addressing the most responsible men and women direct from the workshops. For it is these men who have to drive

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies through in mine, mill, shipyard, factory and field.

He did not do so. Instead, he allowed himself to be manoeuvred by Bevin and Morrison into using the Congress platform for a vicious attack upon the Communist Parties of every country in Europe and for a similar attack upon important trade unions for having resolutions critical of the Government's foreign policy on the agenda.

It was unwarranted and unworthy of the Prime Minister of Britain. It was a speech that no other Prime Minister as the head of the State would be misguided enough to make.

Attlee might very well think over the relationship of forces in Europe, and the need for Britain to form new trading relationships with these countries to counteract an economic collapse in America, before he again makes such a stupid political blunder, for Britain is no longer in a position where it can lay the law down to any country in Europe, with perhaps the exception of Franco-Spain and Royalist fascist Greece.

So far as the Congress was concerned, Attlee's speech missed fire, and the delegate who so forcibly shouted out "Rubbish" was unquestionably expressing the minds of a large section of the Congress. Attlee got his reply sure enough in regard to Greece, Spain and foreign policy as a whole, for the debates and voting on these issues took place *after* Attlee had spoken. Like Isaacs, he too unconsciously helped to stiffen the Congress views on these questions.

Let the resolution of the Electrical Trades Union on foreign policy be placed on record, for despite everything in Congress week that Bevin, Churchill and Attlee could do, it received 2,440,000 votes against 3,557,000; and the unions whose votes are included in this total, represent the cream of the trade union movement in organisation, education and political understanding.

Foreign Policy

This Congress views with serious concern certain aspects of the Government's foreign policy. We note that the policy pursued in Greece has strengthened the hands of the reactionary forces, facilitated favourable conditions for the return of the monarchy and led to the suppression of the progressive forces.

In Spain, the continuation of economic and diplomatic relations with General Franco assists in maintaining a fascist state of society.

In Germany the failure to de-Nazify the country and establish democratic institutions and economic control is in opposition to the agreement reached at Potsdam.

The relationship between the Soviet Union and this country has deteriorated during the past twelve months due to the policy of Anglo-American domination, and the isolation of the Soviet Union, along with the tying of the economy of Britain with that of Capitalist America is in our view extremely dangerous and one that may prejudice the fulfilment of the Government's progressive programme outlined in "Let Us Face the Future." —*Electrical Trades Union.*

The Brighton Trades Union Congress in this formidable minority vote, as in its attitude towards Anders' Polish Army, Greece and Spain, represented a message of hope to the workers of Poland, Greece and Spain that will help them enormously.

There can now be no misunderstanding about what the main demands of the trade union movement are. It wants increased wages, the 40-hour week; more consultation and responsibility in relation both to nationalisation and increased production. It wants a stronger trade union movement in the colonial countries and is ready to play its part in helping forward such movements. It wants the World Federation of Trade Unions to become a mighty world unifying force and it wants the speediest establishment of trade departments of the W.F.T.U. that is possible.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By its reception of the fraternal delegate of the Soviet trade unions, the careful attention it gave to his speech, the Trades Union Congress once again demonstrated its strong desire for the closest possible economic, political and cultural ties with the Soviet Union.

It is ready to back every attack on capitalism that the Government is prepared to organise. There is a restiveness and alarm about the representatives of Big Business who are being given responsible positions in industries down for nationalisation and those that are to have a measure of State control and guidance. This is leading to a dangerous cynicism, which is fatal for any effective drive to secure the all-round increase in production this nation so urgently needs. Nowhere did you find at Brighton that feeling of conviction and elan about nationalisation that you find in other European countries, which Attlee so gratuitously insults. This is all the more dangerous because it is the Trade Union Congress which has always led the fight for real nationalisation.

The recent speeches of Cripps in relation to the capacity of the workers to direct industry and that of Morrison in regard to the profit motive, only confirm the suspicions and cynicism of the active trade unionists in the workshops.

The sooner it is understood that these workers can be won to make the all-out drive for increased production, the better for the nation. But *it can only be done by proving to them that nationalisation means immediate benefits for the working-class at the expense of the capitalist class, and by a complete reversal of all foreign policy and the operation of one in which a Labour Britain is working in the closest co-operation with the Soviet Union and all other progressive Governments in Europe.*

Until these two fundamental approaches are made to the situation, then Attlee can address the General Council and make pious exhortations about production until he is blue in the face, there will not be the response that otherwise would willingly be given. Especially when the shadow of an American economic crisis and its dangers for Britain are so openly admitted by the official organ of the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress—the *Daily Herald.* Let us quote that warning:—

> All those in Britain who are concerned with our national recovery and prosperity will watch anxiously the economic antics which are being reported from the United States. Those antics are a brilliant lesson in how not to conduct a modern economic system. They also carry a pressing warning to this country, both for the immediate future and for the years rather further ahead.
>
> * * *
>
> While we press on with the World Food Board Plans and the international Trade Conference in London, concrete schemes affecting both internal and external British policy ought to be got ready against the danger of a new wave of depression in the United States.—Editorial, the *Daily Herald,* November 2, 1946.

The whole new situation into which we are now so visibly moving gives a quite new emphasis to the part the Trades Union Congress has to play. Just as in past times, new experiences, events and forward developments of the trades union movement have caused the Trades Union Congress to make adjustments in its methods of leadership and policy, so now a new review has to be made.

In 1921 it was felt necessary to reorganise the old historic Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, and to have a General Council, elected on a new basis and with a new conception of leadership. At Hull in 1924, for the first time the Trades Union Congress adopted a Charter

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

setting out for the world to see the aims of British trade unionism.

Since the General Council replaced the Parliamentary Committee, its functions, duties and responsibilities have increased year by year, and there can be no doubt as to the great part played by Lord Citrine, in helping the General Council and the Trades Union Congress to become one of the strongest and most formidable sections of the labour movement of Britain, one that is no poor relation of the Labour Party, but a vital and responsible movement, that has made possible the rise of the Labour Party to power, and helped to formulate policies that Governments have been compelled to recognise.

Earlier in this article I mentioned the multiplicity of issues the General Council now has to undertake and for the purposes of discussion, I would like to make a suggestion about the future role of the General Council.

With the nationalisation of certain industries, the Government are naturally calling upon the trade unions to allow some of their leaders to assume positions of responsibility in such industries. A case in point is the appointment of Lord Citrine and Ebby Edwards to the Coal Board. There are bound to be further appointments of this character.

But the point now arises that with the more responsible and recognised position trade unionism is going to play in industry, does this not also demand a fresh review of the part the General Council itself has to play on behalf of the Trades Union Congress?

If the trade union movement is called upon to let some of its leaders go to organise nationalisation, ought it not also to realise that the work of the General Council itself demands that some of its best leaders should now serve on the General Council in a full-time capacity and not endeavour to carry out their duties as members of the General Council in between their functions as general secretaries or presidents of their individual trade unions.

In my opinion a position has been reached where it becomes impossible for the General Council to fulfil its responsibilities to Congress on its present method of organisation and leadership. You have only to watch the proceedings at recent Trades Union Congresses to see that it is only a very small proportion of the General Council members who are able either to state or defend a case in Congress. An impossible burden is being placed on, for example, men like Sir Joseph Hallsworth or Mr. Allen, now that Lord Citrine has undertaken other work. How can Arthur Deakin, for instance, really do his duty to his union, the General Council and the W.F.T.U.?

I profoundly disagree with the political outlook of so many of the General Council members, as they do with mine, but I do not believe they will disagree with the importance of the issue I am now raising.

We must face facts. However competent the staff work of the General Council may be, this can never be allowed to become a substitute for leadership. For, with the greatest respect, such staffs are in the main drawn from people with no experience in the factories, in the class struggle or the mass movement. The problems now coming up are so vast and important that Congress ought to have a leading core of the very best and most capable leaders the trade unions can give.

Just consider one or two of the new problems. The new role of trade unionism in nationalised industry—the relation of trade unions and working parties—the necessity for a general overhaul of trade union organisation as a whole—trade unions and production—trade unionism and increasing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mechanisation — trade unions and Government legislation—trade unions and the economic perspective.

At once we can see a host of new problems that call for new thinking, a new approach, a fearless facing up to all issues of trade union representation and structure which will inevitably arise.

Can the Congress be content to let matters take their course? If adjustments to meet new conditions had to be made in the 'twenties, why not in the 'forties, when they are more serious, far-reaching and responsible?

If the boilermakers and engineers consider it necessary to have full-time executive committees to look after the interests of their members; if the N.U.R. and A.S.L.E. & F. have executive committees that are in session for weeks at a time because of their problems, why do we allow a position to continue where the General Council as the representative of the whole trade union movement only meets for a day once a month as a whole?

It is an impossible position for Congress and Council alike, as the events will surely drive home before long.

There will be objections to any change, of course. There always are. But now is the time to begin the fight for the changed conception of the General Council that the situation demands.

It will mean that membership of the General Council is no longer the reward for long service in the movement, no longer the subject of vote bargaining as between one trade union group and another. It will demand giving up certain individual trade union preserves, it will call for team work of the highest order, but it will prevent the danger of either Congress or General Council being dominated by one man.

Such a General Council as I have in mind would be elected by Congress, after nominations from the affiliated organisations to the Trades Union Congress. The unions should be prepared to allow their most competent leaders to be nominated. It may be necessary to have a wider Council elected around the leading group of full-time Congress leaders, on the same democratic elective principles previously mentioned.

The strongest possible competition should take place for election on the General Council. It should be looked upon as a scandal that year after year there can be group after group on the Council who are never subject to election. Nominations should be asked for from the factories, from local and district trade union organisations, and be approved either by annual trade union conferences or by ballot vote of the trade union membership.

If nationalisation is to be a success, if the trade unions are to play their vital role in the transition period from capitalism to Socialism, it is more important for the unions to give their best men to the General Council than it is to release them for Government positions. The first is the necessary guarantee that those who take on Government positions will be able to carry out their serious duties with the whole-hearted co-operation of the whole trade union movement.

I believe that, important as are the many decisions the Brighton Trades Congress made, significant as is the turning point, it represents in British trade unionism, salutary as it was in its warning to the Government—a warning that Attlee, Morrison and Bevin only ignore at peril to the Labour Government, even more important are the new organisational and leadership problems that Brighton also raises.

It is in the hope that this aspect of the position will now be adequately discussed that this article has been written, because it is fully realised that in the historic development of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British labour movement, the trade unions have always played a major part.

They are now called upon to play a greater and nobler part, one in which their initiative and unifying endeavours can do much to make the Labour Government realise in time that the class struggle is still with us, that wages do matter, that shorter hours do count, that increased production must find its reflection in better conditions for the working class, that capitalism must be weakened, that the rich must be forced on to lower standards of living, and that, above all, it is capitalism and not socialism that is the main enemy of the organised working-class.

The Elections in France

by DEREK KARTUN

THE elections of November 10 in France continued the trend, noticeable in the two previous elections, towards polarisation of the conflicting political forces in the country. The Communists made substantial gains and so did the extreme reactionary Republican Liberty Party (P.R.L.). The "centre" parties with their equivocal policies based upon constant conflicts within their ranks failed to maintain their positions. Both Socialists and Popular Republican Movement (M.R.P.) lost votes. The Radicals, the traditional party of anti-clericalism and middle-class conservative democracy, failed to stage the come-back which was widely expected of them. The Gaulist Union of Rene Capitant, a new group of political careerists with no programme save a blind support for de Gaulle and his authoritarian views on the Constitution, won a small number of seats. It is interesting to compare the November 10 results for Metropolitan France with the results obtained at the last two elections in October, 1945, and June, 1946.

The Socialists have lost ground heavily and so have the M.R.P. In both cases there are solid reasons for the changes. The Socialists went into the election campaign with an exclusively anti-Communist platform. They had already done this last June and the figures then had proved conclusively that such tactics fail to preserve their left-wing votes and do nothing to win votes from the M.R.P. to the right. Logically enough, those people in France who are exclusively concerned with voting anti-Communist prefer to vote for the M.R.P. or some group to their right. But the Socialists repeated their tactics in November with the same results. Further, the Socialist Party suffered at the polls as a result of bad work in the Government. Felix Gouin's name was inextricably involved in the great scandal of the black market in wine. Their food minister in the days immediately following the liberation had left an impossible legacy to his successors which the people had not forgotten. Their policy on Germany, dictated in the

	October 1945	June 2	Nov. 10
Votes cast	19,661,515	19,883,138	19,148,744
Communists	5,004,121	5,203,046	5,475,955
M.R.P.	4,580,222	5,589,130	5,033,430
Socialists	4,191,152	4,198,110	3,454,080
Left Group (including Radicals)	2,017,665	2,179,067	1,971,660
P.R.L. and right	2,000,0 0	2,623,679	3,136,630

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

final analysis by their close ties with the Labour Government here, was a highly unpopular one. And Leon Blum's trade agreement in Washington, negotiated immediately before the June elections, is now appearing more and more as an instrument designed to tie French economy to Wall Street. All these factors, taken in conjunction with the vacillating and uninspiring aspect that the Socialist Party has acquired as a result of the loss of its working-class basis, have led sincere Socialists to vote increasingly for the Communists and anti-Communists to vote, in accordance with the Church's instructions, "in the most effective way." All the Socialist polemics against the Communists have not succeeded in persuading anyone that they have the type of alternative policy, together with the men to carry it out, which could replace the dynamic drive of the Communists.

The M.R.P. lost many of their right-wing votes to the P.R.L. They were votes which had always gone before the war to the parties of the extreme right. After the occupation, in the course of which these parties had become discredited by collaboration, the reactionary vote was transferred almost entirely to the M.R.P. Then, as it became clear that there would be no purge in France and that reaction had emerged from the war a good deal stronger than anyone expected, the right commenced the process of abandoning the M.R.P., who were compromised in their eyes by their part in the nationalisation projects of the last two Governments. A certain amount of unification took place on the extreme right and French reaction is now crystallising around the P.R.L. The basic difference between them and the M.R.P. is that the majority of the leaders and supporters of the M.R.P. believe in democracy (whatever their views upon the new Constitution) whereas the majority of the P.R.L. do not. To understand what is taking place on the right it is necessary to recognise the fact that reaction in France thinks constantly in terms of overthrowing the regime and instituting an authoritarian system in its place.

The Communists have gained a quarter of a million votes in Metropolitan France alone and have made impressive advances in the Colonies. Here again the reasons are substantial. First and foremost are the truly immense achievements of the Communists in the Government. Croizat, at the Ministry of Labour, has introduced a body of legislation in a year which would have required five years before the war. Under the most adverse economic conditions he had won advances in wages, pensions, compensation and working conditions. Maurice Thorez, as Minister of State, has introduced a comprehensive reform of the Civil Service which has been highly popular in the country. At the Ministry of Industrial Production Marcel Paul, with the toughest assignment of all, has been an outstanding success. There have been other things which have increased public confidence in the Communists. Their German policy has been profoundly popular. Their continued fight to get collaborators punished; their own unblemished record in administration; their obvious energy and determination and their profound ties with the working people—all these things combined have made a picture of a mighty, uncorruptible, energetic and clear-headed party. You have to be in France to realise what an effect of contrast is produced between them and every other party in the country. The Communists say repeatedly that they are "continuing France," that they represent the only truly patriotic forces left in the country. Their record in the Government and their record in the workshops have convinced people of the truth of their slogan. Their extra 272,000 votes come from the indus-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial towns and the agricultural districts of western France.

The election results establish statistically that if the Socialists had accepted the repeated Communist proposals for common lists in the elections they would have won many more seats than they did. It is probable that the two parties together would have had a majority of seats in the Assembly, enabling them to form a left-wing Government. The determination of the Socialist right-wing leadership to have as little to do with the Communists as possible has cost the Socialist Party dearly. Worse, it has denied the French working-class the possibility of having their own Government and has reproduced a balance of forces within the Assembly which will make the organisation of a stable Government difficult. The last Socialist Congress demonstrated that a great number of Socialists have learned this lesson. The repetition at the November elections of what happened in June may help this process of education within the Party. It is the greatest need in France today.

Labour, Socialism—and Mr. Morrison

by ALEX MASSIE

IN its 1945 election programme the Labour Party declared itself to be "a Socialist Party, and proud of it," a Party whose ultimate purpose is "the establishment of a Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain."

This declaration is in keeping with the definition of Objects in the Constitution of the Labour Party: "to secure for the workers by hand and by brain the full fruits of their industry . . . upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange." The same aim is expressed in the rules of the Communist Party: "to achieve a Socialist Britain in which the public ownership of the means of production and exchange shall replace the existing capitalist system."

This similarity in formal statement of general aims has led many to suppose that the difference between Marxists and non-Marxist Socialists is one of method only. Actually, the matter goes much deeper: differences over method are secondary to and arise from differences in the understanding of what is meant by Socialism—and, indeed, by capitalism.

Certainly there were profound differences between, say, MacDonald and Marxists over "method." The Marxist could never accept the view that "the Socialist method is that of moving out step by step, and of walking by sight and by faith at the same time." But this empirical, gradualist "approach to Socialism" was the logical consequence of an underlying idealist conception of the process of social development, of the nature of capitalism and of Socialism as stages in that development, and of the transition from the one to the other.

Thus, MacDonald held the view that "in human history one epoch slides into another," that this mode of social progress is brought about by a process whereby "individuals formulate ideas, society gradually assimilates them, and gradually the assimilation shows itself on the social structure." This works out in the sense that "political programmes today are being moulded by the demand, emanating from the individual conscience, that society should do justice, that merit should be rewarded, that the righteous should not need to beg for bread." As to capital-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism, "the idea that capitalist society is based on private property is a mere chimera" — consequently, all "the Socialist wants" is "society to be organised so that the ownership of property by the few will not mean that a great mass of people must exist in poverty." As to Socialism, "the scattered fragments of reform promised by the political parties . . . are but the foreshadowing of Socialism" when they are "followed out, joined together, Socialism is the result."

Socialism, therefore, "is quantitative, not qualitative"; it is "not the uprising of a class" but the rise of "social unity and growth towards organic wholeness." Given those views, it follows logically that "the existence of a class struggle is of no importance to Socialism unless it arouses intellectual and moral antagonism": the "motive force of Socialism" is not the class struggle of the workers against capitalism, but "the condemnation of that struggle."

The charlatan who concocted this travesty of Socialism (in *Socialism and Society* and *The Socialist Movement*) is dead and damned, his philosophy described by his successor, Mr. Attlee, as "essentially fascist." It should not be forgotten, however, that MacDonald was accepted by the reformist wing of the labour movement as their spiritual leader and that, by their choice, he was Premier in the second Labour Government at the very moment of his monumental betrayal.

That was tragic enough; it was even more tragic that the movement as a whole did not draw the full conclusions from this object lesson by decisively rejecting the anti-Marxist, empirical reformism of MacDonald. Of what use was it to protest, as Mr. Morrison did, that we must now "put Socialism first" if the conception of Socialism was to remain that of MacDonald?

That this conception does still prevail among certain Labour leaders has had striking confirmation in a speech made by Mr. Morrison on October 27 —a speech which prompted the above reflections.

Many Socialists must have rubbed their eyes in amazement and dismay when they learned from reports of this speech that Mr. Morrison holds the conviction that there is "no need to abolish the profit motive," and that "the Government is not out to abolish the profit motive" which, in itself, is "right and justifiable." The aim of the Government was to "make it work for the people and not for the few" by having it "socialised and harnessed to the larger interests of the community."

True, Mr. Morrison wagged an admonitory finger at the capitalists on the grounds that "the working of the profit motive in this country has been marred by three enormous abuses." These, he said, "must be corrected." The capitalists must "recognise and honestly admit these abuses and assist in rooting them out" so that it would be "possible to speak of the profit motive as having an honourable part to play in society."

The object of the Labour Party, as we have seen, is to secure for the workers the *full fruits* of their labour by establishing *common ownership* of the means of production. Mr. Morrison, it seems, pursues a different object, limiting himself to the correction of certain "abuses" incidental to the working of private ownership.

The first of these, in Mr. Morrison's view, is that the profit motive has been "used as an excuse for exploiting labour and treating workers as a commodity instead of as people." It becomes evident that Mr. Morrison follows in the tradition of the Fabian mentors of MacDonald and, like them, has "accepted economic science as taught by the accredited British professors" (as was confessed with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such disarming frankness in *The History of the Fabian Society*).

The exploitation of labour and transformation of labour-power into a commodity is not an abuse, but the very essence of the capitalist mode of production; the profit of the capitalist class as a whole—and not just that of the "bad" employer — is derived wholly and solely from exploitation of the working-class. But this is not the place for an exposition of Marxist political economy.

In any case, Mr. Morrison is not likely to pay much heed to such a "foreign" doctrine. Our reformists pride themselves on having evolved a distinctive "British" Socialism derived from native sources. It is rather curious that in their search for home-grown sources they should have overlooked the teachings of Thomas Hodgkin. Long before the first Marxist work on the subject, Hodgkin was—in the 1820's—reading lectures on Popular Political Economy in which he pointed out that "the labourer is not allowed to work unless, in addition to replacing whatever he uses or consumes, and comfortably subsisting himself, his labour also gives a profit to the capitalist on all the capital which he uses or consumes while engaged in producing." Hodgkin condemned this as exploitation and enslavement of the workers; it is left to Mr. Morrison to praise it as "right and justifiable."

But, then, Mr. Morrison is discovering as right and justifiable so many things that have been condemned and fought against by the labour movement. Imperialism, for example: "I am a great friend of the jolly old Empire, and we mean to stick to it." No wonder the Fabian Colonial Research Bureau protests that this "makes a travesty of our work, a mockery of our sincerity, and a hypocrisy of our professions."

Mistaking the objective for its realisation, Mr. Morrison proclaims that "we, the British, are the pioneers in the new political and social order." A queer order it is: an Empire without imperialism, private ownership and private profit without capitalism. These—imperialism and capitalism—remain only as "obsolete labels" which mischievous outsiders "attach to us."

It would be a dreary business to pursue Mr. Morrison further through his new order, for which "the British Commonwealth (blessed word!) is the model . . . the pattern of political, economic and social progress . . . which the rest of the world will increasingly find itself following."

It would be an impertinence to Mr. Morrison to dismiss these statements as irresponsible chance remarks. It would be a mistake, on the other hand, to confine oneself to a criticism of each statement by itself. Their essential content, over a wide range of subjects, is so uniform as to leave no doubt but that we have to do with a connected system of views, with the consistent expression of a definite conception of Socialism and of the role of the labour movement.

The views are neither new in themselves nor new to Mr. Morrison. Compare his present endorsement of the profit motive with an appeal he made in 1929: "I want every business man and every business manager to realise that the Labour Government is not their enemy, but that every member in this Government wants to take him by the hand, treat him as a man and a brother, and help to make his commercial or industrial enterprise more successful than it has been in the past."

Nor are these views peculiar to Mr. Morrison; his guilt is not that he has founded a new school of Socialist thought, but simply that he expresses so crassly views that are shared by a majority of his colleagues in the Labour Government and in the leadership of the Labour Party. These views

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

represent the reformist, Social Democratic conception of Socialism—the outlook that was fostered in the labour movement by Fabianism on the grounds that "something must be put in the place of Marx" (see *History of the Fabian Society*), and of which Ramsay MacDonald was the personification.

Mr. Dalton has described MacDonald as a "political disaster"; the greater political disaster is that MacDonaldism was not cleared out of the labour movement together with MacDonald. One of the proofs that it has continued to dominate the outlook of many Labour leaders is that in Mr. Dalton's *Practical Socialism for Britain* one finds numerous passages that read like an echo from the works of MacDonald quoted above. One example is his use of the words. "Socialism is a quantitative thing. It is not a question of all or nothing, but of less or more." Could the idea that there is no fundamental difference between capitalism and Socialism, that capitalism will "grow into the Socialist State" by the gradual quantitative accumulation of "instalments" of Socialism—i.e., of reforms within the framework of capitalism—be more clearly expressed!

Lest his meaning be not sufficiently clear, Mr. Dalton goes on to elaborate his contention that Socialism is not qualitatively, but only quantitatively different from capitalism: "... we may measure the degree in which any particular community is Socialist by the relative extent of the 'Socialised' sector and of the 'private' sector in its economic life ... there is no civilised community which has no socialised sector ... no nucleus of a planned economy. All have a system of public finance and some public services—including law, police, civil administration, and some armed forces, as an irreducible minimum." That, in the Social Democratic view, is Socialism—"less or more"!

* * *

The Brighton Trades Union Congress in October revealed that large sections of the working-class movement are highly critical of the Labour Government in respect of the way in which it is interpreting in practice many aspects of the policy on which it was elected. The growth of this critical spirit is a welcome and healthy sign: it is a proof that the whole movement would back the Government in a bolder, more aggressive policy against capitalist reaction at home and abroad. So far, criticism has been confined, in the main, to this or that aspect of Government policy. There has been no widespread discussion in the movement over such questions as, for example, the connection between the outlook betrayed by Mr. Morrison in the speeches quoted above and those aspects of the work of the Labour Government which were so sharply criticised at the Trades Union Congress.

Yet there is a direct connection between the two, between the Social Democratic philosophy which prevails in the upper ranks of the Labour leadership and the practical policies pursued by them. The conflict over practical-political policies is, at bottom, an ideological conflict, a conflict of ideas, to determine whether the Social Democratic or the Marxist outlook will prevail in determining the course to be taken by the movement.

But it is not yet fought out openly, as a war of ideas, in a way that will draw masses of workers into a study and critical weighing-up of Marxism and Social Democracy. That it should be lifted up to and fought out on this plane—as well as on particular issues of policy and tactics—is becoming a matter of urgency.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Churchill's Record

by E. M. WINTERTON

CHURCHILL'S leadership of the anti-Soviet propaganda crusade has seemed to many people a bewildering change of complexion, after the wartime professions of admiration and friendship for the U.S.S.R. Yet the recent revelations of American writers like Capt. Butcher, naval aide to Eisenhower, or Elliott Roosevelt, son of the President, should have proved that there was, already, in wartime, another side to those professions. Refusal to launch the second front in Western Europe, first in 1942 and then in 1943, it is stated by these witnesses, was inspired by political considerations, not military—since the American commanders were convinced of its feasibility. What were the political considerations? We have only to compare the tangible result of the policy of postponing the second front until 1944—less than 400,000 British dead in six years of war, over seven million Soviet dead—with the hope expressed by Colonel Moore-Brabazon, then Churchill's Minister of Aircraft Production, at a private meeting in Manchester in the autumn of 1941 (as reported at the T.U.C. by the President of the A.E.U.)"that the Russian and German armies will exterminate each other, and while this is taking place we, the British Commonwealth of Nations, will so develop our Air Force and other armed forces that, if Russia and Germany do destroy each other, we shall have the dominating power in Europe." Churchill was very angry that this was disclosed—but did not repudiate the sentiments.

At this point, however, it is worth looking a little more closely at Churchill's record—particularly because not everyone knows the earlier passages in his political history.

It was Churchill who played the leading part in organising the invasion of Soviet Russia in the autumn of 1918. Reporting to the Russian quisling representative in Paris, Sazonov, in May, 1919, one of his agents, General Golovin, said he had seen Churchill, who "told me the question of giving armed support was, for him, the most difficult one. The reason for this was the opposition of the British working-class to armed intervention. But even in this matter, without promising anything, he would try to help. . . . As far as the North was concerned, he had a pretext—that of supporting the British troops already there. But the idea of supporting Denikin, were it even by volunteers, would be carried out by him. . . . He intends to ask for twenty-four million pounds sterling for the supply of all our fronts. . . . Churchill told me that in all Russian questions he recognised only Admiral Kolchak, that no measures are taken by him without the latter's consent: among other things, he expressed himself thus: 'I am myself carrying out Kolchak's orders' " (text brought back by the official Labour Delegation to Russia, 1920).

Both in war and in peace, Churchill has never forgotten or abated his enmity to the Soviet regime. Here are some examples of what he has called it: "of all tyrannies in history the worst, the most destructive, the most degrading" (January 11, 1919); "foul baboonery" (February 19, 1919); "that foul combination of criminality and animalism" (April 10, 1919); "avowed enemies of the existing civilisation of the world . . . a gang of mutinous slaves" (January 3, 1920); "deadly snakes" (in a memoran-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dum to Lloyd George in March, 1920).

Nor did the establishment of diplomatic relations change his language, even when he was a Minister of the Crown: "a gang of cosmopolitan adventurers" (September 20, 1924), "a regime which was criminal in its origin and aims" (September 27, 1924), "these foul, filthy butchers of Moscow" (October 27, 1924), he called them. After the Locarno Pact, and particularly after the Tory Government of which he was a member had broken off relations with the U.S.S.R., Churchill rose to new heights—"a band of cosmopolitan conspirators gathered from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America" (November 28, 1925), "miscreants who had ruined their own country" (June 19, 1926), "unfit for civilised intercourse" (July 23, 1927) and so forth.

His friends are not averse to spreading the impression that, when the Nazi danger was overhanging all Europe, Churchill put away this kind of talk. But it is not true. Even after Munich, in October, 1938, he broadcast to the U.S.A. an attack on what he called "Communist tyranny," referring to the Soviet Union, and saying it was "the same thing spelt in different ways" as Nazi rule, that it taught the delights of aggression to children, maintained the "cult of war," etc. And no one who heard it can have forgotten his broadcast of January 20, 1940—three months before the German storm broke on Western Europe—in which he gratuitously attacked the "military incapacity of the Red Army," and proclaimed: "Everyone can see how Communism rots the soul of a nation: how it makes it abject and hungry in peace and proves it base abominable in war."

Moreover, although Churchill would gladly have it believed that his hatred of the U.S.S.R. and of Communism is inspired purely by love of democracy, his record as an "anti-fascist" has some suspicious blots. In an address to the fascists of Rome in January, 1927 (of course, there was no Nazi Germany then, and the Tory Government was doing its best to mobilise Europe against Russia), Churchill said: "If I had been an Italian, I am sure I should have been entirely with you, from the beginning to the end of your victorious struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism." So also in October, 1933, when Hitler had only been in power a few months, and was giving good hopes to the Tories that he would "go east," not west, Churchill opposed constitutional reforms in India (at the Joint Select Committee), referring to democratic institutions as "now falling into disrepute in the Western world." And in the winter of 1936, when the fascist rebellion in Spain, organised by Hitler and Mussolini, was raging at the gates of Republican Madrid, Churchill sought to defend Franco in the *Evening Standard*, writing that "it is idle to claim that a constitutional and Parliamentary regime is legally or morally entitled to the obedience of all classes, when it is actually being subverted and devoured from day to day by Communism."

In plain English, this appears to mean that democracy was only acceptable to Churchill so long as it did not injure the interests of the propertied classes. And this is the heart of Churchill's doctrine, behind all his phrases and posturing.

"His chief interest is in the condition and welfare of the poor in England," the Irish rebel aristocrat and anti-Imperialist Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, recorded in his diary on September 5, 1909, after a talk with Churchill. " 'I would give my life,' he said, 'to see them placed on a right footing in regard to their lives and means of living.' " Within a year of this touch-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing declaration, as Home Secretary, Churchill sent troops and police against the miners on strike in Tonypandy: and in 1911 he threatened to send 25,000 soldiers to Liverpool to break the dock strike. His part in the General Strike of 1926 is well known: he helped to build up in secret the national strikebreaking organisation known as the O.M.S., before the strike, and controlled the "British Gazette," official organ of the Tory Government, during the struggle—in which he referred to the 2,000,000 workers on strike as "the enemy," and wrote to the editor of *The Times:* "I do not at all agree with the idea that the T.U.C. have as much right as the Government to publish their side of the case."

The British propertied classes have, apart from the surplus value created by the British workers, another important source of income: the Empire. On this, too, Churchill has been staunchly loyal to his cause. He explained his position to Blunt, on the occasion mentioned above, as "optimistic Liberal Imperialism, where the British Empire was to be maintained, in part by concession, in part by force, and the constant invention of new scientific forces to deal with growing difficulties of Imperial rule."

Guided by this eloquent formula, Churchill had no time for democracy where colonial peoples are concerned. On Egypt he said: "We shall continue to hold it whatever happens; nobody will ever give it up—I won't—except we are driven out of it at the end of a war" (September 5, 1909), and: "We shall never clear out of that till the Empire breaks up" (January 30, 1912). Even the present "negotiations" with an unrepresentative Egyptian Government, conducted under the shadow of British bayonets, tanks and guns in the heart of Egypt, are too much for Churchill.

So also on India. "We have no intention whatsoever of relinquishing effectual control of Indian life and progress," he told Conservatives on December 11, 1930: and later, opposing even the puny concessions of the Baldwin Government (in a broadcast on January 29, 1935), Churchill had the audacity to try and interest British Labour in holding India in subjection: "If we lose India . . . it would be more like two million breadwinners in this country who would be tramping the streets."

British workers against Soviet workers, colonial peoples against British workers, force against colonial peoples, and security for British millionaires: these are the ingredients of Churchill's political creed.

Malaya's "Constitution"

by H. B. LIM

(Secretary of the Malayan Democratic Union)

THE publication of the White Paper was, on the whole, an appreciable attempt to give Malaya a centralised constitution with a measure of self-government and equal political and economic privilege among all Malayan citizens. The White Paper also foreshadowed the creation of a Malayan citizenship. Although there were obvious defects in the Constitutional scheme—such as the separation of Singapore from the mainland and the anomalous retention of "the individual status and identity of Penang and Malacca,"—the broad intentions of the White Paper could

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still have been developed towards the elimination of the pre-war semi-feudal and colonial constitution.

In practice, the Colonial Office deviated from even these broad principles. Firstly, the people of Malaya learnt after the publication of the White Paper that Sir Harold McMichael and the Malay Sultans had agreed on the White Paper *in toto* on behalf of the Malayan people. A further shock came when the Sultans of Johore, Kedah and Perak publicly dissociated themselves from their signatures to the McMichael Agreement. Some of them even alleged duress in securing their signatures.

Whatever may be the merits of the Sultans' allegations, it is abundantly clear that the Colonial Office had studiously omitted to invite public representatives to discuss the scheme. The Colonial Office could not have forgotten that since the signing of the Pangkor Agreement in 1874 and the subsequent series of treaties of cession of administrative rights by the Sultans of the various Malay States, the Sultans had lost their sovereignty and, consequently, their right to negotiate as representatives of the people. It was the ensuing resentment of the people of Malaya rather than the sudden disclaimer by the Sultans, which gave rise to the present political crisis.

The attempt by Captain Gammans —Conservative member for Hornsey —to represent the constitutional crisis as the outcome of the violation of the Sultans' "sovereignty" was both factually and chronologically incorrect: for he completely ignored the fact that the sovereignty of the Sultans had long ceased to exist, that they were not forced into the McMichael Agreement, and that the country-wide protest of the people was all along as vehement and consistent as the disclaimer by the Sultans was sudden and inconsistent.

When Captain Gammans himself visited Malaya in June this year, he sedulously confined himself to the Sultan's clique, and avoided the popular Malay Party (M.N.P.) and the other democratic organisations in Malaya. On his return to England, Captain Gammans gave a distorted report of the situation, describing Malaya as on the brink of a revolution as a result of the alleged violation of the Sultans' "sovereignty." He also made sly reference to the grave danger of "communism" should the Sultans' grievances not be redressed. If the country was on the brink of a revolution, it was in reality, more the result of Captain Gammans' ill-conceived propaganda.

The surprising fact is that the Colonial Office began to follow the line of development indicated by Captain Gammans, and has since staged a long drawn-out series of negotiations with the Sultans. Nearly ten months after the publication of the White Paper, the people of Malaya were still agitating for full consultation in framing the new Malayan constitution. Ultimately, when the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. George Hall, was asked in the House of Commons to clarify the point, he replied that no major steps would be taken until full consultation with all parties had been achieved. He also stated that the Advisory Councils which had been set up in Singapore and the Malayan Union were merely of an advisory nature, and were not effecting any legislation.

Once again, in its practice, the Colonial Office went wide of its stated intentions. In the first place, there never was set up any consultative body of a representative nature to discuss the problems of the constitution. In the second place, the so-called Advisory Councils were set up by Government nomination and their members did not represent any political organisation except themselves. Thirdly, in spite of Mr. George Hall's statement, these Advisory Councils have been doing the work of legislation. Enactments,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such as those governing Finance, Patents and the "Shoot-to-kill Order" were passed by them. The only semblance of fully representative consultation of "all parties" promised by Mr. George Hall took the form of casual and informal chats with certain political party representatives. Throughout the Citizenship Committee consultation, for instance, no indication was given of what took place, or what the Government intended to do with the recommendations.

A typically cynical distortion of "representation" was the public notice inviting individuals and public organisations to submit their written views on the future of the Singapore Municipal Constitution. No consultation of any sort followed after the closing date, no statement was made as to the acceptability or otherwise of the recommendations sent in. The only development was the publication of the Constitution Committee's final recommendations to the Governor; and these were, quite naturally, the recommendations of a Constitution Committee which was an entirely Government-appointed body.

One of the startling recommendations was the property qualification of candidates for election, viz., ownership of property assessed at 720s. per annum or, tenancy of premises valued at *not less than 60s. a month.* Bearing in mind that the average earned income of Malayan wage-earners is hardly 30s. a month, this property qualification excludes at least 90-95 per cent. of the people from candidature. The rest of the recommendations are not worth a moment's thought, after this criminal mockery of the principles of electoral representation.

In the meantime, in spite of the promises of the White Paper, the appointment of Advisory and Municipal Councillors by the Governor continues apace. It is a significant indication of the colonial policy that all the persons so appointed are either business men or well-seasoned "Yes-men" from the middle professional class. It is important to point out, too, that none of these men could, by any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as leaders of any class; nor have they shown any record of being socially or politically educated. These appointments appear to follow a set pattern, by which the Chambers of Commerce, the individuals of big business, and the socialite class were exclusively represented.

Thus, by a freak of reaction, the Labour Government in Britain has fathered a lusty family of colonial Tories. It is hard to believe—were there not so many developments of a similar kind elsewhere—that the Labour Government could wilfully entrust "the progressive development of free institutions" in the colonies to bodies whose ideology and station in life are diametrically opposed to the principle of action of the Labour Party. If the anomaly were only the result of muddle, the blame must be laid on those in the Labour Government who have allowed themselves to be moved by robust reactionary propaganda. In point of fact, the "Communist" bogey has been held up before the eyes of the Colonial Office whenever any progressive development is demanded by the progressive, and *therefore anti-Tory parties in Malaya.* Waving the red bogey has been enough.

The aggregate result of this constitutional swindle is that, all popular Malay, Chinese, Indian and Eurasian organisations are being antagonised. This was clearly indicated when, in July this year, a local press report announced that as a result of the negotiations with the Sultans, the Malayan Union plan would be scrapped and the pre-war Federal Constitution reintroduced. Although the Colonial Office later denied the accuracy of the report, the ensuing protest showed beyond

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubt the resentment of the Malayan people against any retrograde measures.

The Colonial Office is strongly urged to send out a fully-representative Commission that is prepared to pledge itself to the task of full consultation with all parties and opinions in the country.

One thing the Colonial Government has ignored, and it is one which decides the success or failure of any scheme. It is this, so long as it obstructs the path to popular representation, so long will its plans fail to find efficient and popular support. This is a fact which underlies all social, economic and political undertakings. This is a fact which must be fully grasped in practice if Malaya is to achieve the unity and democratic self-government which liberation from the Japanese implied.

Disarmament

V. M. Molotov's Speech

(Delivered at the Foreign Press Association Dinner in New York on November 11)

MAY I first of all thank you and the Foreign Press Association for the invitation to this banquet in honour of the United Nations Organisation. The Soviet delegation readily accepted this invitation. It regards the present gathering as one of the facts testifying to the respect for the international organisation which is serving the high aims of the United Nations.

The war ended in our victory. The nations are aspiring towards a free use of the benefits of universal peace. The "ordinary people," those who constitute the tremendous majority of the population in all countries, have but one desire, and that is that opportunities to use the benefits of universal peace shall be as durable as possible, as lasting as possible. They have a legitimate right to expect this, especially after their great exploits and sacrifices during the war.

We should not forsake or underestimate the rights of those who by their daily toil are creating all the values and all the achievements of civilisation, the successes of which we enjoy. We shall hardly be mistaken if we say that they will appraise their statesmen and public leaders by how well they prove capable of securing a peaceful life for the peoples, a rising standard of life, the enjoyment of the benefits of culture and a free life. They are presenting these demands to the new international organisation, too, which now unites as many as 54 states.

We, members of this international national organisation, should bear in mind our responsibility towards the nations. We ought not to mind if the free press reminds us of our duties by criticising our shortcomings.

The press is not uniform, of course. I am far from asking you to treat the press without discrimination. I am sure that that section of the press which affects a militant tone in peacetime, risking in its zeal the straining of its vocal chords on the high notes, cannot enjoy the true and lasting sympathies of really wide sections of the people. But neither should we doubt that the forces and opportunities of the press are indeed inexhaustible, when it is really concerned for peace among nations, for their welfare, national independence and freedom.

It goes without saying that in referring here to the press, I have certain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

special considerations in mind. I would like to call the attention of the press to one problem, the vital character of which can hardly be contested. Furthermore, there are reasons for believing that this important problem of international co-operation could now begin to be solved by the joint efforts of the United Nations.

As you know, the Soviet delegation submitted a proposal on a general reduction of armaments. It is also known that the delegation of the United States of America gave its support to this proposal at the General Assembly, and at the same time advanced some additional considerations.

Discussion on these questions in the United Nations Organisation is still before us and one should not anticipate it. But the American delegation has already given support to the Soviet Union's proposal, and I may state that the Soviet delegation for its part is also willing to meet the delegation of the United States half-way. We may already now assume that the proposals of the Soviet and American delegations can be brought into harmony.

We should all make a serious effort to realise this great task. Not one single delegation to the General Assembly has made any objections to discussing the question of a general reduction of armaments. Moreover, we know that several delegations met this proposal with full approval, while others were willing to discuss it. I hope that we shall now be able to tackle this question directly, and lay the foundation for solving the problem of a general reduction of armaments right now, at the present session of the General Assembly in New York.

Given these prerequisites, the press can do a great deal in this direction. The press would make no mistake if it took this important and vital problem to heart.

It is indubitable that a general reduction of armaments, including the prohibition of the production and utilisation of atomic energy for military purposes, complies with the interests of all peace-loving nations. Inasmuch as a reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atom bombs will have a universal character, not one single country will be able to evade the demand that it take measures of that kind, and no country will enjoy a privileged position.

After the rout of our common enemies, who have been disarmed for many years to come, we can now embark upon a reduction of armaments in our own countries too. Thereby we shall put an end to the armaments race that has started. We should carry out a general reduction of armaments, according to a unified plan and under the immediate guidance of the United Nations.

A reduction of armaments must considerably reduce the number of people in the armies, navies and air forces. These measures will bring about a big reduction of military budgets and a reduction in the burden of taxation on the population, and this should improve the living standards of the working people. A general reduction of armaments will facilitate the consolidation of international peace and security, so eagerly sought by the peoples of both small and great countries. By rendering the necessary support in the solution of this problem, the press will fulfil one of its greatest tasks.

The success of the press in this honourable task will be of historic importance and will conform to the deepest and, indeed, to the most heartfelt sentiments and aspirations of the nations towards durable peace and progress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

Transatlantic Tariffs

Commercial Policy in the Canadian Economy by Orville John McDiarmid (Harvard University Press: published in England by Geoffrey Cumberlege, price 25*s*6*d*.

A Century of American Life Insurance by Shepard B. Clough (Columbia University Press; published in England by Geoffrey Cumberlege, price 30*s*).

THE FIRST of these books is one of those pieces of academic economic research which, while it may be useful to the specialist, makes very dull reading for the ordinary reader, who tends to get lost in the mass of detail. The object of the book is to trace the development of Canadian customs tariffs from 1763 to 1939 and to show how these have been used to promote and foster Canadian industries, particularly against competition from the United States. The struggle over tariff policy is treated mainly in terms of the parliamentary rivalries of the Liberal and Conservative parties, but the underlying economic conflicts and contradictions do occasionally manage to peep through. The author shows, for example, how the demand for tariffs was originally based on the need to protect Canada's "infant" industries against the competitition of more mature foreign rivals; then, when the process of concentration and centralisation of capital had led to the growth of monopolies in Canadian industry, the argument was switched to the need for tariffs to fight trade depression and to maintain prosperity and employment. The tariff, in fact, became the main weapon in the trade war against the Canadian capitalists' main rivals, the powerful capitalists of the United States who, themselves protected by the Hawley-Smoot tariffs, were trying to "export unemployment" by dumping their surplus products over the border. The author concludes that the results of the tariff "do not inspire confidence in that instrument as a device either for securing crisis-free industry or for stimulating investment and employment opportunities. . . . Protected capital and durable consumer goods industries have curtailed production and maintained prices (during the depression) to a much greater degree than lay within the power of more exposed industries." (Incidentally, the only successful case of "trust-busting" in Canada was in the paper industry, which was unlucky enough to arouse the opposition of the even more powerful Press Association.)

To the Marxist the most interesting thing in the book is some information quoted from the Canadian censuses. Between 1881 and 1891 the capital of manufacturing industries increased by 114 per cent., while the number of employees increased only by 44 per cent. and the wages paid by 68 per cent. The gross value of product increased by 53 per cent. and gross profits (i.e., gross value of product less cost of wages and raw materials) by 70 per cent. These figures would appear to indicate a rapid increase in the organic composition of capital and a considerable corresponding fall in the rate of profit during this period. The figures for the period 1900 to 1910 are unfortunately not quoted in full, but those given suggest that the same trends were continued.

The second book was written to celebrate the centenary of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, at the request of the company. As might be expected, it has some technical interest for the insurance expert, but very little for anyone else, particularly as the Mutual Life does not transact industrial life insurance (the "1d. a week"), which is what the working-class family is mainly concerned with.

F.V.

Primitive Accumulation in New England

Government and Labor in Early America by Richard B. Morris (Columbia University Press (Geoffrey Cumberlege) 1946, pp. xvi+557, 45*s*).

THIS MASSIVE volume on the legal and social history of American labour during the colonial period (1600-1775) is one of those specialist works of which Plekhanov once wrote:—

> "Stones cry out if men are silent. The scholar-specialists know nothing of Marx' theory: yet the results they have achieved shout loudly in its favour."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Morris studies both free and "bound," or indentured labour (most of the unskilled and semi-skilled belong to the second category) in the thirteen original colonies of North America. He speaks of "long years of investigation," and we can well believe him. For example, from the court records of innumerable counties he has extracted accounts of 20,000 cases: as well as lavishly using contemporary newspapers, diaries, correspondence and printed literature.

The results show the colonial system of triumphant English capitalism emerging, even 2,000 miles away, with the heavy stamp of feudal absolutism still deeply marked on its features. The capitalists, after 1660, shook off Tudor restrictions: but the workers still fell under their lash, and the young capitalist class, in America as in England, took full advantage of this. The author constantly reminds us of the essential link between English and American economic development in the period.

Compulsory labour for the poor and whipping of the unemployed: fixing wages through the justices, themselves men of substantial property: achievement of relative freedom only by the small element of skilled workers whose labour had a high scarcity-value (although most of them, except in Pennsylvania, were still disfranchised well after the Revolution): importation of indentured white labour on a big scale, for a century before negro slaves took its place: the leniency with which murder and torture of the unfree workers —men and women—was treated by the courts: the brutal repression of strikes, combinations and workers' revolts—Mr. Morris draws a severely documented picture of all these characteristics which can be paralleled only in the scarifying historical chapters of the first volume of Marx' *Capital*.

In this mirror the American people, looking upon their remote past, will recognise much that is nearer the present day. From the regime of the capitalist property owners of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries descended the methods and the ideology of the nineteenth century slave-owners. And Mr. Morris reveals many traits of the colonial masters that repeat themselves in the twentieth-century monarchs of American finance-capital at Detroit and Pittsburg, in California and Chicago, in Korea and China.

A. R.

The New Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia by Commander E. P. Young ("Citizens of the World" No. 1. St. Botolph Publishing Co., 118 pp., 3*s*6*d*). COMMANDER YOUNG, author of a well-informed book on pre-Munich-Czechoslovakia, published in 1938, continues his good work of creating understanding and sympathy for one of the most progressive countries of Europe by bringing the story of Czechoslovakia up to date. The little book is full of facts and figures and gives a clear analysis of the fundamental changes brought about by the national revolution of the Czechs and Slovaks. The only criticism that could be made is this, that comparatively too much space is devoted to the conditions of the First (pre-Munich) Republic which belongs to a past never to return, while both the development from Munich to the resurrection of Czechoslovakia and the basic institutions and the social and political conditions of the Third Republic are treated rather shortly.

Nevertheless, the book can be recommended as a reliable guide to a detailed knowledge about one of the most promising developments in liberated Europe.

J. W.

Manual for Exploiters

An Approach to Management by G. E. Milward (Macdonald & Evans, x+82 pp., price 8*s*6*d*).

MUCH HAS been written, over a number of years, about management—scientific and otherwise. Much of it has been plain unadulterated hooey with the object of establishing a parasitical class of so-called professional workers on the books and at the expense of the actual producers.

The author tells us that he "has spent some ten years collecting, evaluating and reporting upon technical books" dealing with management, which he thinks is of poor quality. The author makes no claim "that management is a science" and perhaps he agrees with Sir Harold Hartley, K.C.V.O., M.C., F.R.S., Hon. Fellow Balliol College, Oxford, who writes the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreword (and one supposes that he should know something about management) when he writes "Management has reached the stage when certain accepted principles are beginning to emerge, but it is still an art rather than a science, and indeed it will always depend on the art of human sympathy and understanding." However, the author states in his preface "The study of Scientific Method can give a valuable background to all who aspire to the higher ranks of management . . . and it is the foundation on which a number of new professions have been built."

The author has divided his work into two parts, Part I "The Human Factor and the Management of the People" and Part II "The Management of Work," and under these two main headings there are approximately forty sub-headings.

The author, under the heading of Science and Management on page 75 of this 80-pager, appears to bust the thin veneer of culture which obscures the true meaning of the preceding 74 pages. "It is," the author states, "interesting to examine the development . . . of what has been dignified by the title of the "Scientific Management Movement," for the reason that it supplies a historical background to the development of some of the principles and methods applicable to all forms of work. The Management of Efficiency Engineer came into prominence towards the end of the last century, at a time when national and international commercial competition were beginning to make themselves felt in what had up to that time been a "seller's market" and, *in excelsis*, a British seller's market, when demand exceeded supply and competition was comparatively feeble. Manufactures saw the need to cut prices to maintain sales against competitors, but they also saw the possibility of an increase in trade at a lower margin of profit, if prices could be satisfactorily reduced. There were two possible ways of increasing output:—

(1) By building and equipping additional premises with most modern plant.

(2) By increasing output from existing premises, machinery and men.

The author goes on to state, "The second alternative proved the more attractive, for it asked for no capital expenditure, and suggested on good evidence that ample dividends were to be obtained from increasing efficiency. So the apostle, Milward, goes on "Scientific Management in its first applications represented an independent and logical, if not scientific, approach to efficiency, and it proved successful in achieving the objective which had been given to its practitioners—that of achieving productivity per man hour through a complicated process of measuring, comparing, controlling the whole process of factory production and, by implication, if not deliberately, all discoverable factors affecting working, including working conditions, wages and sometimes salaries."

Scientific Management, another name for Taylorism, means under capitalism the scientific exploitation of mankind for the benefit of the few.

Scientific Management, under Socialism, would mean "How, When and Where" to do a job in the interest of the community and under such conditions management becomes an honourable and facinating profession, as managers who worked during the war with joint production committees know full well.

The publishers of this book print on its jacket "The key to efficient production in a free community is to make a man want to work, to teach him how to work and to direct his work rightly." The author should note this advice for future works of art. When a man owns his house no one has to teach him the need to work in order that it be kept in a state of repair, but if the house belongs to a landlord—it is different.

This book is not written in order to induce men to work; it is, however, written for the professional manager who is successful only in so far that he obtains the maximum amount of work from the minimum number of workers for the benefit of the shareholders. Shop stewards should borrow it from the libraries, read it in order that they can guide the workers in their struggles for a shorter working week, equal pay for equal work and decent standard of living, and the fight against those scientific managements whose sole purpose in life is the scientific exploitation of the workers in the interest of a few idle shareholders.

J.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Publications Received

BOOKS

Syria and Lebanon by A. H. Hourani (O.U.P., 18*s*, 402 pp.).
Federal Government by K. C. Wheare (O.U.P., 15*s*, 278 pp.).
From Savagery to Civilisation by Dr. Grahame Clark (Cobbett Press, 7*s*6*d*, 112 pp.).
A Short History of Labour Conditions in the British Empire. 1800 to the Present Day. Vol. 1, Part 2 by Jurgen Kuczynski (Frederick Muller, 8*s*6*d*, 194 pp.).
A Cartel Policy for the United Nations by the Editor, Corwin D. Edwards (Columbia University Press, 8*s*6*d*, 124 pp.).
The United States after the War. Introduction by C. W. de Kiewiet (Cornell University Press Geoffrey Cumberlege) 15*s*6*d*, 180 pp.).
Lenin, 1918-1919, Collected Works, Vol. XXIII, edited by Alexander Trachtenberg (Lawrence and Wishart, £1 1*s*., 540 pp.).
Recent Occupational Trends in American Labour by Anderson & Davidson (Stanford University Press (OUP), 9*s*6*d*, 134 pp.).
The Socialist Tradition by Prof. A. Gray (From Moses to Lenin) (Longmans, Green & Co., 21*s*, 524 pp.).
Language of Men by A. L. Morton (Cobbett Press, 7*s*6*d*, 94 pp.).
Left Turn, Canada by M. J. Coldwell (V. Gollancz, 7*s*6*d*, 192 pp.).
Families in Trouble by Earl Lomon Koos (Kings Crown Press, N.Y. (per O.U.P.) 15*s*6*d*, 134 pp.).
Ireland Her Own by T. A. Jackson (The Cobbett Press, 18*s*, 444 pp.).
The Outlook of Science by R. L. Worrall, M.B., Ch.M. (Staples Press Ltd., 12*s*6*d*, 192 pp.).
Democracy in France by David Thomson (O.U.P. (Geoffrey Cumberlege) 10*s*6*d*, 284 pp.).
The Discovery of India by Jawaharlal Nehru (Meridian Books Ltd., 25*s*, 490 pp.).
John Hilton by Edna Nixon (Allen & Unwin, 15*s*, 344 pp.).
Occupational Placement by Anna Y. Reed (Prof. New York University) (Cornell University Press (per O.U.P.) 22*s*6*d*, 350 pp.).
Beyond Supply and Demand by John S. Gambs (Columbia Universty Press per O.U.P., 10*s*6*d*, 105 pp.).
Marxism and the Democratic Tradition by A. Landy (International Publishers, New York, 2*dols*50*c*, 220 pp.).
World Monopoly and Peace by James S. Allen (International Publishers, New York, 3*dols*, 288 pp.).

PAMPHLETS

Oxford University Pamphlets on Indian Affairs :

No. 2. The Position of Women by Lakshmi N. Menon (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 19. The Problem of Population by Gyan Chand (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 20. Tariffs and Industry by John Matthai (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 21. Nutrition by W. R. Aykroyd (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 22. Racial Elements in the Population by B. S. Guha (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 23. Soil Erosion by Sir Harold Glover (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 24. The Meaning of Dominion Status by S. M. Bose (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 25. Winning the Peace by T. L. Brayne (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 26. Siam by Sir Josiah Crosby (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 27. Broadcasting by Seth Drucquer (O.U.P., 9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 28. Mineral Resources by A. M. Heron (9*d*, 32 pp.).
No. 30. Tibet by David Macdonald (9*d*, 32 pp.).

Soviet News Pamphlets

The Last Days of Berlin by Lt.-Col. P. Troyanovsky (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 48 pp.).
Co-operatives in the Soviet Union by V. Batov (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 68 pp.).
Molotov Speaks (*Soviet News*, 6*d*, 28 pp.).
Front Line Heroines (*Soviet War News*, 1*s*, 48 pp.).
The Case of War Pensioners in Russia by P. P. Verzhibilovsky (Soviet News, 1*s*, 48 pp.).
The 16 Soviet Republics. A Handbook of Essential Information (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 64 pp.).
Soviet Union at the San Francisco Conference (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 72 pp.).
Education in the U.S.S.R. (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 48 pp.).
Moscow Trial of 16 Polish Diversionists, June 18-21, 1945 (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 68 pp.).
Social Insurance in the U.S.S.R. by Z. Mokhov (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 48 pp.).
Sport in the Soviet Union (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 64 pp.).
Property Rights of Soviet Citizens by Mikhail S. Lipetsker (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 46 pp.).
Stalin and Molotov address their Constituents (*Soviet News*, 6*d*, 36 pp.).
Labour Protection and Accident Prevention in the U.S.S.R. by N. Alexandrov (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 44 pp.).
Musical Education and Music Making by Boris Yagolim (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 72 pp.).
Voice of the U.S.S.R. (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 79 pp.).
Labour Protection and Accident Prevention in the U.S.S.R. by N. Alexandrov (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 44 pp.)
Musical Education and Music Making by Boris Yagolim (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 72 pp.).

Labour, Research Department

Exit the Trades Disputes Act by R. Page Arnot (3*d*, 12 pp.).
Wages, Prices and Profits (6*d*, 28 pp.).
The Cost of Living Index (3*d*, 12 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in November, 1946 : £47 : 17 : 6

A Tribute from a New Reader

20th November, 1946.

The other day I bought a copy of LABOUR MONTHLY (November issue), and I must say I am greatly taken with it for, amongst other excellent qualities, its sheer outspoken truth.

Allow me, sir, the honour of congratulating you on a really first-class periodical, which seems to have in abundance precisely that which most other journals in this country lack—namely, a complete fearlessness in the whole-hearted championship of a really worthy cause.

	£	s.	d.
The Rev. G. Warren		3	0
K. B. Kay		3	0
H. Williams		3	0
N. Shaw		3	0
W. McG. Morgan ...		8	0
D. H. Strathern and Friends		5	0
P. S. Bour		2	6
H. Martin, for Socialist Society	2	13	0
F. Wedlake		2	6
E. Morgan		3	0
Senta Kameradschaft		10	0
J. Smith		1	6
T. Flood		2	6
R. F. B.	3	0	0
F. Renouf		5	0
R. E. Pratt		1	6
C. H. B. Locke ...		10	0
J. B. Pyatt		3	0
E. D. McCallum ...		2	6
F. Richards		3	0
Ali	1	0	0
J. Nathan		13	0
Joan—Bristol		5	0
P. H. Holway ...		3	0
F. H. Softley		10	0
J. Baron		10	0
J. Lust		3	0
W. F. Lakin-Smith ...		2	6
R. P., ex S. R. ...		5	0
P. T. C.		14	0
H. E. C.		15	0
V. S. Dodwell ...		2	6
Mr. & Mrs. Humphreys		3	0
P. G. Husbands ...		3	0
Office Worker ...		2	0
V. L. D.		2	6
J. Tringham		3	0
K. M. G., *Ex-Rhodesia*		2	6
H. E. Smith		5	6
J. E. Laws		1	6
J. R. Lloyd		3	0
H. Ross		14	0
A. A. Woolf		5	0
H. A. B.	5	0	0
G. P. Bugden ...		13	0
D. Goldring		10	0
W. G. Maddison ...	1	0	0
D. Rees		10	0
J. B.		5	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
N. S.		6	9
P. R. Moore		3	0
Learner		2	0
Anon—Whitchurch ...		1	0
J. W. Turner		4	0
Wm. Turney ...	1	0	0
M. Luxemberg ...		6	0
Anon		11	6
Four Greeks		4	0
Office Worker ...		1	3
V. A. D.		5	0
J. A. Purton		5	0
L. H. Mills		4	0
R. Ware		3	0
A. Wall		5	0
Director	2	0	0
R. Herring		3	0
M. Nicholas		5	0
P. O. Sorenson ...		6	0
Old Age Pensioner ...		2	0
A. V. Richards ...		3	0
H. J. Knight		3	0
D. Percival		13	0
J. R. Lloyd		6	0
J. Pack		6	0
L'Humanite		2	0
S. Mill		10	0
Anon—Whitchurch ...		1	0
O. Greene	3	0	0
Socialist Sailor ...	2	10	0
V. R. Pearson ...		2	6
R. D. Warnes ...		10	0
R. Anderson		5	0
The Bacon Family ...		5	0
K. L. Morrison ...		5	0
K. M. G., Ex-Rhodesia		2	6
R. D. Warnes ...		10	0
D. E. F.	2	0	0
A. G. Neville ...		7	0
R. Green		3	0
J. E. Spencer		3	0
C. A. Moore	2	2	0
Scottish Committee C.P.		10	0
P. N. Brinson ...		10	0

BOUND VOLUMES

A few copies of the following Bound Volumes are still available.

Post us your order immediately.

1927	....	£1	10 0	1943	....	15	0
1928	....	£1	10 0	1944	....	15	0

All prices inclusive of postage.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COBBETT PRESS

Make it your Christmas Gift

REFORMERS AND REBELS

A Calendar of Anniversaries

Dec. 2nd **6s.** 146 pp.

Distributors: CENTRAL BOOKS LTD., 2/4 PARTON ST.

81 Chancery Lane, W.C.2

STUDY AT HOME FOR

B.Sc. ECON.

Men and women who wish to prepare for post-war opportunities should obtain the London University B.Sc. Econ. degree. It is a valuable qualification not only for teaching or administrative posts under Education authorities, but also for statistical research and welfare work in commerce, industry, and T.U. organisation. The degree is open to all. Prepare for it at home under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall; tuition fees may be paid by instalments. At the 1945 (External) Exam. 36 out of 48 W. H. Students Passed, 21 in Honours.

Prospectus post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D, Director of Studies, Dept. JK17,

WOLSEY HALL, OXFORD

A few copies left

KARL MARX — POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS

by Prof. ROY PASCAL ... 1/-

THERE ARE NO ARYANS

Racial Theories Exposed

by R. PAGE ARNOT ... ... 6d.

Postage 1d.

From :—

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4. in the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED